

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, July 26, 2012
MAG Office
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Oddvar Tveit, Tempe, Chairman
Elizabeth Biggins-Ramer, Buckeye, Vice Chair
Kristen Sexton, Avondale
Jim Weiss, Chandler
Jamie McCullough, El Mirage
Jessica Koberna, Gilbert
Wade Ansell for Doug Kukino, Glendale
* Cato Esquivel, Goodyear
Greg Edwards for Scott Bouchie, Mesa
William Mattingly, Peoria
Philip McNeely, Phoenix
Tim Conner, Scottsdale
Antonio DeLaCruz, Surprise
* Mark Hannah, Youngtown
Ramona Simpson, Queen Creek
* American Lung Association of Arizona
Kristin Watt, Salt River Project
Rebecca Hudson, Southwest Gas Corporation
* Mark Hajduk, Arizona Public Service Company
* Gina Grey, Western States
Petroleum Association
* Dawn M. Coomer, Valley Metro/RPTA
* Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association
Jeannette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau

Steve Trussell, Arizona Rock Products Association
* Amy Bratt, Greater Phoenix Chamber of
Commerce
Amanda McGennis, Associated General
Contractors
* Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of
Central Arizona
* Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward
* Kai Umeda, University of Arizona Cooperative
Extension
Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of
Transportation
Trevor Baggione for Diane Arnst, Arizona
Department of Environmental Quality
* Environmental Protection Agency
* Jo Crumbaker, Maricopa County Air Quality
Department
Michelle Wilson, Arizona Department of Weights
and Measures
* Ed Stillings, Federal Highway Administration
* Judi Nelson, Arizona State University
Christopher Horan, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Indian Community

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Participated via telephone conference call.
+Participated via video conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments
Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments
Taejoo Shin, Maricopa Association of Governments
Matt Poppen, Maricopa Association of Governments
Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments
Kara Johnson, Maricopa Association of Governments
Adam Xia, Maricopa Association of Governments
Feng Liu, Maricopa Association of Governments
Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments
Randy Sedlacek, Maricopa Association of
Governments

Mitch Wagner, Maricopa County Department
of Transportation
Scott DiBiase, Pinal County Air Quality
Wendy Crites, Salt River Project
Sam Brown, City of Scottsdale
Agustin Figueroa, Arizona Rock Products
Association
Rusty Van Leuven, Arizona Department of
Agriculture
Heather Hodgman, City of Apache Junction
Tom Elsren, Maricopa County Air Quality
Department

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) was conducted on July 26, 2012. Oddvar Tveit, City of Tempe, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:30 p.m. Jim Weiss, City of Chandler; Jamie McCullough, City of El Mirage; Greg Edwards, City of Mesa; Amanda McGennis, Associated General Contractors; Christopher Horan, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community; Elizabeth Biggins-Ramer, Town of Buckeye; and Antonio DeLaCruz, City of Surprise, attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

2. Call to the Audience

Mr. Tveit stated that according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out comment cards, which are available on the tables adjacent to the doorways inside the meeting room. Citizens are asked not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for nonagenda items and nonaction agenda items. Mr. Tveit noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Approval of the April 26, 2012 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the April 26, 2012 meeting. William Mattingly, City of Peoria, moved and Tim Connor, City of Scottsdale, seconded, and the motion to approve the April 26, 2012 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

4. Update on the MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM-10

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments, provided an update on the MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM-10. She stated that the Committee recommended adoption of the plan at the April 26, 2012 meeting. On May 23, 2012, the MAG Regional Council unanimously adopted the MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area. Ms. Bauer indicated that copies of the plan were hand delivered to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) on May 23, 2012 after the MAG Regional Council adopted the plan. She noted that a copy was transmitted to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as well, on May 23, 2012. Ms. Bauer stated that on May 25, 2012, ADEQ officially submitted the MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area to EPA.

Ms. Bauer reviewed the EPA completeness finding on the plan. She stated that EPA made the completeness finding on July 20, 2012 which stops the sanctions clocks that began when the 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 was withdrawn. Ms. Bauer commented that this is good news for the region and a credit to the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. She noted that the next step is for EPA to take action on the plan. The EPA must take action on the MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 by February 14, 2013. Ms. Bauer added that an approval action is needed to avoid a Federal Implementation Plan. She discussed that 2012 is the attainment year and the importance of avoiding a violation at the air quality monitors. The region will need three years of clean data, years 2010, 2011, and 2012, for EPA to approve the plan and say that the PM-10 standard has been met. A copy of the completeness finding letter was provided to the Committee.

5. Update on PM-10 Exceedances and Exceptional Events

Ms. Bauer discussed the PM-10 exceedances and exceptional events. She stated that there have been nine days of PM-10 exceedances in 2012. Ms. Bauer indicated that most of the exceedances appear to be exceptional events. She noted that ADEQ is continuing to work on the documentation required for the 2011 exceptional events. Ms. Bauer mentioned that ADEQ now has consultant assistance in compiling the exceptional event documentation. She stated that MAG staff is assisting ADEQ and will continue to provide support in the compilation of exceptional event documentation. Ms. Bauer discussed that the exceptional event documentation preparation and submittal to EPA is critical. She noted that EPA concurrence with the exceptional event documentation is needed to show three years of clean data. Ms. Bauer mentioned that there were no violating monitors in 2010. She indicated that 2011 had 21 days of exceptional events and that the extensive exceptional events documentation for events dating July 2, 2011 to July 8, 2011 has been submitted to EPA by ADEQ. Ms. Bauer stated that ADEQ is working on the documentation for the remaining exceptional event days in 2011. She asked the member agencies and private sector to help the region stay clean at the monitors and throughout the region.

Mr. Tveit inquired if the number of exceptional events in 2012 is more than usual. Ms. Bauer responded that meteorology is a big factor with exceptional events. She noted that 2010 was a clean year, yet 2011 had the epic dust storm and many other exceptional events that lasted until November 2011. She noted the exceptional events in 2012. Ms. Bauer mentioned that 2011 was an unusual year due to the size and number of dust storms, and added that meteorology and drought conditions contribute to the number of events.

6. Revised Draft EPA Exceptional Events Guidance

Matt Poppen, Maricopa Association of Governments, presented the Revised Draft EPA Exceptional Events Guidance. He indicated that a copy of the documents pertaining to the Revised Draft EPA Exceptional Events Guidance released on June 27, 2012 were provided in the agenda packet. Mr. Poppen discussed that the revised guidance documents are in response to comments provided by state, local and tribal agencies on the initial draft guidance documents issued in May 2011. On July 6, 2012, EPA published the notice of availability and the public comment period for the Draft Guidance to Implement Requirements for the Treatment of Air Quality Monitoring Data Influenced by Exceptional Events and associated attachments. Mr. Poppen stated that public comments are due to EPA by September 4, 2012.

Mr. Poppen provided an overview of the previous MAG comments on the May 2011 guidance documents and the responses from EPA. The first MAG comment stated: EPA should provide that implementation of Reasonable Available Control Measures (RACM) and Best Available Control Measures (BACM) will be considered to meet the Exceptional Events Rule (EER) requirements related to "reasonable controllable or preventable". Mr. Poppen stated that this was a common comment submitted by many agencies. He stated that with regard to our region, the controls in place, RACM and BACM, that have been approved in rules and State Implementation Plans (SIP), should be adequate to fulfill the requirements. Mr. Poppen indicated that EPA's response included the creation of a Prospective Control Analysis; a separate document that reviews an area's current windblown dust controls, implementation of controls, and creates a high wind threshold. The Analysis would be valid for three years. If EPA were to approve the Prospective Control Analysis, the Analysis could be referenced in exceptional event submittals. Additionally, Mr. Poppen stated that if EPA has an

approved SIP (less than three years old) with high wind controls and an agreed upon high wind threshold, EPA would consider those controls reasonable. He noted that the response also indicated that the windblown dust BACM has to be related to high wind controls and not low wind sources.

Mr. Poppen presented the next MAG comment: EPA should not specify a minimum wind speed for definition of a high wind exceptional event (EE) or create a regulatory presumption as to minimum wind speed. He stated that the initial EPA guidance used 25 miles per hour (mph) as the threshold for high wind EEs. Mr. Poppen noted the EPA response in the new guidance: “In identifying a high wind threshold, the EPA does not intend to set a bright line as to what speed constitutes a high wind dust event or to categorically concur with all events with sustained winds above a given threshold. The high wind threshold is the minimum threshold wind speed capable of overwhelming reasonable controls on anthropogenic sources or causing emissions from natural undisturbed areas.” Mr. Poppen indicated that the EPA guidance document suggests that agencies develop a high wind threshold for each area experiencing high wind dust events. He stated that the MAG region will likely need to develop a high wind threshold, since the 25 mph default is too high for many of the EEs in the region. Mr. Poppen discussed that the high wind threshold can be submitted separately, as part of an event demonstration, as part of the Prospective Controls Analysis, or as part of the High Wind Action Plan (HWAP). Wind tunnel tests, scientific literature, and/or monitoring data can be used to identify local thresholds.

Mr. Poppen discussed the third MAG comment on the initial May 2011 guidance: EPA should not link the “recurrence” criteria in the statutory exceptional event definition to requirements for additional controls or to otherwise establish a “more than once a year” definition of recurrence. Mr. Poppen explained that the previous guidance expected a higher level of control for areas with recurring exceptional events and that the controls would be progressively more intense as more events occur. The EPA response to the comment stated “in assessing whether an event was not reasonably controllable, the EPA would take into account whether the high wind event type was recurring such that more effective, but costly, controls would be reasonable compared to the situation in which a high wind event had been a unique occurrence...the EPA has reconsidered this approach and is de-emphasizing recurrence.” Mr. Poppen added that the guidance document was modified to de-emphasize recurrence when assessing “not reasonably controllable or preventable” analysis and made a basic controls analysis more robust while also adding the Prospective Controls Analysis and HWAP options.

Mr. Poppen presented the fourth MAG comment: If the EPA decides to allow for voluntary High Wind Action Plans, the Agency should not require continual revision and updating of the plans. He mentioned that previously EPA would have required constant revisions of the HWAPs with recurring events. However, de-emphasizing consideration of recurrence and the addition of a Prospective Controls Analysis should address these concerns. Mr. Poppen discussed that in the new revised guidance documents, a HWAP is largely designed for newly-identified sources of windblown dust. He indicated that a HWAP may not be as useful for our region since most of the sources of windblown dust have been readily identified. EPA does address nonattainment areas in regard to HWAPs specifically in the Draft High Winds Guidance document. EPA response was: “A PM nonattainment area is expected to have reasonable controls in place, but there may be new sources or improved controls that are identified after the original implementation of reasonable controls. Additionally, during high wind conditions, sources outside the designated area may contribute to violations in the nonattainment area. EPA will consider the wind speeds in the event(s) in question relative to the high

wind threshold in determining if additional controls are reasonable.” Mr. Poppen stated that EPA may request an area submit a HWAP in order to concur on some events if EPA believes additional reasonable controls are required.

Mr. Poppen presented the next MAG comment: EPA should recognize that exceptional events can and do occur at one monitor while other monitors in the same area may not violate an air quality standard. He mentioned that this occurs with our region. The EPA response to the comment: “EPA agrees that high wind dust events can affect one monitor and not others and has revised the draft High Winds Guidance document to more clearly reflect this point. Agencies believing this scenario occurred in their areas are encouraged to explain the spatial extent of the exceedance in the conceptual model of their demonstration. For example, if the agency describes the event as a regional dust storm, then the EPA would expect monitors within the same regional scale to be similarly affected by the dust storm. Note that if the exceedance is due to low wind speeds, or sources that should have been reasonably controlled then this event would not meet the ‘not reasonably controllable or preventable’ requirement.” Mr. Poppen commented that EPA is now allowing the inclusion of a single monitor exceedance; the exceptional events documentation simply needs to clearly describe and document the event in the conceptual model.

Mr. Poppen discussed the next MAG comment: EPA should accelerate the time frames for review and decisions on exceptional events and not require up to 18 months for Agency review. The EPA response stated: “The EPA will strive to review packages in less than 18 months, but the EPA’s review of some demonstrations may take a full 18 months.”

Mr. Poppen presented the final 2011 MAG comment: EPA should consider additional technical information with regard to wind speed and aerodynamic entrainment and correct errors in its analysis of these matters. The EPA response includes: “While the information presented in MAG’s detailed comments provides useful information on the mechanics of windblown dust in some areas, the high wind threshold is intended to represent the conditions that are capable of overwhelming reasonable controls on anthropogenic sources (i.e., significant emissions from controlled sources) or causing emissions from natural undisturbed areas, not the wind speed at which any level of emissions could occur from any source. This approach is also consistent with the Natural Events Policy where EPA required air agencies to define the conditions in which BACM level controls were overwhelmed.” Mr. Poppen stated that the region has determined that 12 mph is the threshold for dust emissions on both disturbed and undisturbed sources. He discussed that EPA is looking for a high wind threshold at which controlled sources produce enough dust to cause an exceedance of the air quality standard. Mr. Poppen commented that the EPA high wind threshold begins at the point that controls are overwhelmed. He added that, “EPA now suggests that agencies develop a local high wind threshold for each area experiencing high wind dust events and that the threshold should be supported and justified by local research.” The development of a local high wind threshold will be necessary for our region since the current threshold of 25 mph is too high.

Mr. Poppen provided additional highlights from the Revised Guidance Documents. He stated that the EPA guidance acknowledges the existence of extreme exceptional events (haboobs, tornados, volcanic eruptions) and that they may require more limited documentation. He noted that examples of limited document often were not provided. Mr. Poppen indicated that EPA has determined that reasonable controls generally would not need to be implemented for undisturbed natural landscapes. He indicated that the revised guidance states, “The EPA still maintains that the reasonableness of controls can

depend on the number of days per year on which they will have an air quality benefit.” Therefore, EPA still maintains that the recurrence of exceptional events might lead to the implementation of reasonable controls which may be stricter and more costly than current controls. The guidance also touches on intrastate transport that requires an evaluation on whether neighboring county emissions are not reasonably controllable or preventable. Mr. Poppen stated that this intrastate transport comment in the guidance may affect future submittals. He indicated that EPA is also deferring a decision of whether to revise the Exceptional Events Rule, despite numerous comments to do so. Mr. Poppen added that no new dispute resolution process was proposed in the guidance or as a possible rule revision. Mr. Poppen commented that EPA is requiring that the wind speed be expressed as an hourly average, instead of the five minute average that is currently documented in Arizona submittals. He indicated that if one hour exceeds the threshold EPA will generally accept that high winds caused the exceedance. For rural areas that do not have meteorological data, EPA is allowing for the use of modeled wind speeds. Mr. Poppen stated that in EPA’s Notice of Availability, EPA considered Arizona’s recent submittal for the July 2-8, 2011 exceptional events an example of a stream-lined submittal mainly because multiple exceedance days were submitted in one demonstration. He noted the size of the submittal.

Mr. Poppen discussed that EPA is soliciting comments on several topics, including the following: streamlining the process; available web-based information, links, and tools that would be useful; available sources of wind data and their use in setting local high wind thresholds; additional feedback on converting one-five minute wind speed data to hourly data; how useful is the Prospective Controls Analysis and High Wind Action Plan; technical analyses demonstrating wind speeds exceeding high wind threshold and that the exceedance was caused by not reasonably controllable emissions; the utility of the “information only” (“I”) flag; and how to characterize extreme events.

Mr. Poppen discussed the implications of the Revised Guidance for the Maricopa Region exceptional events. He stated that the workload required to document exceptional events is unlikely to be less under the implementation of the revised guidance. An approved Prospective Controls Analysis may help in regard to future events, but significant work is required to produce a Prospective Controls Analysis that would only be valid for a few years. Mr. Poppen commented that another implication is that the High Wind Action Plan will likely not be of use in our region, since EPA associates these primarily with newly-identified sources. However, EPA may require a HWAP if they deem that there are additional reasonable controls that have not been implemented for that area. Mr. Poppen discussed that the region will need to develop a local high wind threshold for when BACM and other local controls are overwhelmed, as the 25mph default is too high for this region. He noted that EPA still maintains that it can require additional controls beyond RACM/BACM, or what may exist in the SIP and/or local rules when evaluating an exceptional event, if EPA determines the current controls are not reasonable. Mr. Poppen mentioned the final implication is that EPA may still take 18 months to approve the exceptional event demonstrations.

Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of Transportation, inquired if additional controls beyond RACM and BACM are implemented, will a SIP revision be required to include the additional controls as enforceable measures in the PM-10 plan. Mr. Poppen replied that a SIP revision may be a possibility to include additional controls. Mr. Poppen discussed that the guidance document outlines options - first, concur with the exceptional events documentation and place a caveat that additional controls are required in the future, or, secondly, not concur and do a SIP call to add the additional controls. Mr. Poppen added that EPA’s perspective is that the exceptional event documentation

process is voluntary, in that it is separate and distinct from the other Clean Air Act requirements. Due to this view, the definition of reasonable controls is not linked to other Clean Air Act components, like RACM or BACM. Mr. Poppen stated that EPA can require additional controls in order to approve an exceptional event.

Ms. Chenausky asked if someone could request that EPA ask the states to include the additional controls from the Prospective Controls Analysis and HWAP into the SIP. Mr. Poppen responded that he was not certain about that particular scenario. He indicated that the Prospective Controls Analysis evaluates control measures currently in place and the HWAP evaluates new controls. Mr. Poppen added that the Prospective Controls Analysis and the HWAP are part of the exceptional event demonstration documentation.

7. EPA Proposal to Revise the Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter

Mr. Poppen presented a review of the EPA proposal to revise the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for particulate matter (PM). He stated that the last review of the standards was completed in October 2006. During the 2006 review EPA: retained the 24-hour PM-10 standard at 150 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; revoked the annual PM-10 standard; revised the 24-hour PM-2.5 standard from 65 to 35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; retained the annual PM-2.5 standard at 15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; and set secondary standards equal to primary standards. Mr. Poppen explained that these are the current standards in place.

Mr. Poppen reviewed the proposed revisions published in the Federal Register on June 29, 2012. The proposed air quality standards are as follows: retain the 24-hour PM-10 standard at 150 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; retain the 24-hour PM-2.5 standard at 35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; revise the annual PM-2.5 standard from 15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to within a range of 12 to 13 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; set a distinct secondary standard for PM-2.5 to address visibility effects, particularly in urban areas, based on a new 24-hour standard set at either 30 or 28 deciviews (deciview scale is a light scattering scale); retain secondary standards to address non-visibility welfare effects; require one near-road PM-2.5 monitor in each urban area with a population of one million or more; and update the Air Quality Index (AQI) and grandfather certain permits. Mr. Poppen indicated the comments on the proposed revisions to the particulate matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards are due by August 31, 2012.

Mr. Poppen discussed EPA projections of the proposed revisions. Mr. Poppen stated that EPA projects that 99 percent of counties will meet the proposed standards without the need for additional local measures by the 2020 attainment date. He added that EPA projects the Maricopa County 2020 annual PM-2.5 level to be 10.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ which is well below the proposed level of 12 to 13 and is indicative of attainment. Mr. Poppen noted that the Maricopa County current three year (2009-2011) annual PM-2.5 average is the highest at the South Phoenix monitor with a level of 10.50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The lowest PM-2.5 level is at the Mesa monitor with a value of 7.50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. Mr. Poppen stated the middle value belongs to the West Phoenix monitor with a value of 9.64 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. He mentioned that EPA is taking comments on reducing the annual PM-2.5 level to 11 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. EPA projects the 2020 24-hour visibility to be 20 deciviews in Maricopa County.

Mr. Poppen provided an expected implementation timeline. He stated that the final rule is due by December 14, 2012, a date set by consent decree. EPA expects state designation recommendations to be made in December 2013. Mr. Poppen indicated that final area designations would occur in December 2014. He commented that if attainment demonstration SIPs are required, those would be

due in 2018. Attainment dates would then range from year 2020 to 2025. Mr. Poppen stated that based on EPA proposals, Maricopa County is anticipated to be in attainment with the new standards.

Mr. Mattingly inquired how EPA defines urban areas and asked if population density is used. Mr. Poppen replied that the Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) is used. He indicated that our region is in a CBSA with a population over one million and that a near-road PM-2.5 monitor will be required.

8. Update on the MAG 2013 Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan

Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments, provided an update on the MAG 2013 Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for the Maricopa County Area. Ms. Arthur stated that Maricopa County is in attainment of the carbon monoxide (CO) standard, however there are Clean Air Act requirements that need to be fulfilled by early 2013. She mentioned that several CO plans have been prepared by MAG over the years. In January 2001, the Revised 1999 Serious Area CO Plan was submitted to EPA. Ms. Arthur noted that the Revised 1999 Serious Area CO Plan demonstrated attainment of the CO standards by 2000. She stated there have been no monitored violations of the one-hour CO standard since 1986. In addition, there have been no monitored violations of the eight-hour CO standard since 1996. Therefore, when the revised 1999 plan was submitted, the plan was able to show clean data at the monitors, as well as meet all of the planning requirements necessary to demonstrate attainment of the CO standard by 2000.

Ms. Arthur stated that the MAG CO Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan was submitted in May 2003. She indicated that this plan was required for EPA to redesignate the area to attainment. The 2003 CO Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan demonstrated continued attainment of the CO standard through 2015. Ms. Arthur stated that EPA approved both the Revised 1999 Serious Area CO Plan and the CO Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan and redesignated the Maricopa County nonattainment area to attainment effective April 8, 2005. Under section 175A(b) of the Clean Air Act an additional plan is required demonstrating maintenance of the CO standard ten years beyond the initial ten year period. Ms. Arthur indicated that the second maintenance plan is due eight years after the attainment designation which is April 8, 2013 for our region. She added that the maintenance plan must demonstrate attainment through 2025. Ms. Arthur discussed the importance of this upcoming maintenance plan and indicated that it would be the last CO plan required under the current CO standard.

Ms. Arthur discussed the MAG 2013 CO Maintenance Plan. She stated that neither of the two CO standards, the one-hour or the eight-hour, have been violated since 1996. Ms. Arthur indicated that the 2013 maintenance plan will include the existing carbon monoxide measures that were in the previous two plans. Therefore, no new measures will be needed. She discussed that a modeling protocol has been drafted and that maintenance will be demonstrated using three different analyses: Emissions Inventory Comparison, Scaling Maximum Concentrations, and Intersection Analysis.

Ms. Arthur discussed the Emissions Inventory Comparison. She stated that this analysis compares emission trends in 2006, 2008, 2015, and 2025. Ms. Arthur explained that the 2008 emissions will be derived from the Maricopa County Air Quality Department 2008 Periodic Emissions Inventory for CO. She indicated that the latest EPA approved models will be used for the 2013 maintenance plan. Ms. Arthur explained that MOVES2010b will be used as the onroad mobile source emissions model. The NONROAD2008a model will be used to evaluate equipment sources such as construction, industrial, farm, and lawn and garden equipment. In addition, the Emissions and Dispersion Modeling

System (EDMS) version 5.1.3 model will be used to estimate aircraft and airport emissions. Ms. Arthur stated that the data from the new models will be compared to emissions previously produced using other models and included in submitted plans. She added that the 2006 and 2008 data will also be compared to actual monitored concentrations. Ms. Arthur noted that the CO concentrations in the area are low. She stated that the eight-hour CO standard is 9 ppm and in 2006 the second highest eight-hour CO concentration at all monitors in the region was 4.6 parts per million (ppm) or approximately half of the standard. In 2008 it was 3.0 ppm which is one-third of the standard.

Ms. Arthur provided the second analysis of the Draft Modeling Protocol - Scaling Maximum Concentrations. She indicated that the modeling from the 2003 CO Maintenance Plan will be used to compare the maximum modeled eight-hour CO concentrations with emissions to prepare new scaled estimates of the maximum concentrations in 2025.

Ms. Arthur discussed the Intersection Analysis, the third analysis of the Draft Modeling Protocol. She stated that the CAL3QHC model will be used to model CO emissions at potentially high traffic volume and congested intersections in 2025. Ms. Arthur indicated that six intersections will be modeled to ensure that high traffic and high congestion intersections will not contribute to a violation of the CO standard in 2025.

Ms. Arthur stated that all three modeling approaches will be used to show attainment of the eight-hour CO standard of 9 ppm in 2025. MAG will also perform a weight of the evidence demonstration to show that declining concentrations are not due to unusually favorable meteorological conditions. Ms. Arthur indicated that temperatures, wind speeds, and mixing heights and atmospheric stability will all be analyzed to justify that the region's trend of low CO concentrations is not due to favorable meteorological conditions. She added that the 2013 maintenance plan will also establish a new 2025 transportation conformity budget for CO. Ms. Arthur explained that once EPA approves the plan or finds the budget to be adequate, the budget will then be applied in MAG conformity analyses for years after 2024.

Ms. Arthur presented the schedule of the MAG 2013 Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for the Maricopa County Area. She stated that the Draft Modeling Protocol document was sent to EPA for review on June 12, 2012 and EPA concurred with the modeling approach on June 25, 2012. The draft modeling protocol was then sent to ADEQ, the Arizona Department of Transportation, and MCAQD for review and comment on June 27, 2012. Ms. Arthur noted that MAG intends to prepare the Draft CO Maintenance Plan and Technical Support Document by late November 2012. She indicated that the release of the Draft Plan for public comment is scheduled for January 2013. Potential action would be taken by the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee in February 2013 with potential action by the MAG Management Committee and Regional Council in March 2013. Ms. Arthur stated that the MAG 2013 CO Maintenance Plan would be submitted to ADEQ and EPA by the end of March 2013. She noted the EPA deadline for the plan is April 8, 2013. Ms. Arthur stated that the Committee will be updated on the MAG 2013 CO Maintenance Plan at future meetings. Mr. Tveit thanked Ms. Arthur for the presentation.

9. EPA Final Approval of the MAG 2007 Eight-Hour Ozone Plan

Ms. Bauer stated that on June 13, 2012, EPA published a final rule to approve the MAG 2007 Eight-Hour Ozone Plan. The plan demonstrates attainment of the 1997 eight-hour ozone standard of 0.08 ppm by June 15, 2009.

10. Call for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Tveit requested suggestions for future agenda items. Antonio DeLaCruz, City of Surprise, inquired about House Bill (HB) 2798. Ms. Bauer replied that HB 2798 was passed by the Arizona Legislature in 2012 and requires reporting by all levels of government on the implementation of PM-10 measures. She stated that ADEQ will be releasing a form which the State, County, and local governments will use to report annually to ADEQ on the implementation of PM-10 measures. Ms. Bauer indicated that in order to assist ADEQ, MAG has supplied ADEQ with the form that MAG had previously used for information collection through 2010 for the prior MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10. She noted that ADEQ will develop the form and collect the data.

Mr. Tveit indicated that the next meeting of the Committee has been tentatively scheduled for Thursday, August 23, 2012. With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.